

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
CENTRAL DIVISION**

MICKEY CONLEY, Register No. 512073,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 07-4179-CV-C-NKL
)	
DAVID DORMIRE, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

REPORT, RECOMMENDATION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Mickey Conley, an inmate confined in a Missouri penal institution, brought this case under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and its corresponding jurisdictional statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1343. This case was referred to the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge for processing in accord with the Magistrate Act, 28 U.S.C. § 636, and L.R. 72.1. Plaintiff names as defendants David Dormire, F. Connell, Marian Ortballs, David Webster, Bill Galloway and Arthur Woods.

Plaintiff claims cell assignments are made by defendants on the basis of race to achieve "racial balance." Plaintiff further alleges he received a conduct violation for using another inmate's pin number to make a telephone call.

Plaintiff has requested leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee and costs. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Pursuant to the Prison Litigation Reform Act, the court is required to screen prisoner cases and must dismiss a complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if satisfied that the action is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim under which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1) and (2). Additionally, under section 1915(g), if a prisoner, while incarcerated, has had three cases dismissed on any of these grounds, the court must deny leave to proceed under section 1915(a). The only exception to the successive petition clause is when the prisoner faces "imminent danger of serious physical injury." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

On October 1, 2007, plaintiff filed a "Motion for Court Access Injunctive Relief," in which he requests free materials for drafting and mailing court documents. Plaintiff's motion does not merit the granting of court-ordered injunctive relief. Although the federal courts have broad power to grant or deny equitable relief in a civil rights action, Holt v. Sarver, 442 F.2d 304 (8th Cir. 1971), a "large degree of discretion is vested in the trial court" in determining whether an injunction should issue. American Home Investment Co. v. Bedel, 525 F.2d 1022, 1023 (8th Cir. 1975), cited with approval in Rittmiller v. Blex Oil, Inc., 624 F.2d 857 (8th Cir. 1980). See also Cole v. Benson, 760 F.2d 226 (8th Cir. 1985). In Dataphase Systems, Inc. v. C.L. Systems, Inc., 640 F.2d 109 (8th Cir. 1981), the court delineated the factors to be considered in ruling a motion for preliminary injunctive relief.

Whether a preliminary injunction should issue involves consideration of (1) the threat of irreparable harm to the plaintiff; (2) the state of balance between such harm and the injury that granting the injunction will inflict on other parties litigant; (3) the probability that plaintiff will succeed on the merits; and (4) the public interest.

Id. at 113. Further, "[t]he dramatic and drastic power of injunctive force may be unleashed only against conditions generating a presently-existing actual threat; it may not be used simply to eliminate a possibility of a remote future injury, or a future invasion of rights." Rogers v. Scurr, 676 F.2d 1211, 1214 (8th Cir. 1981) (quoting Holiday Inns of America, Inc. v. B. & B. Corp., 409 F.2d 614, 618 (3d Cir. 1969)). Thus, the inquiry is "whether the balance of equities so favors the movant that justice requires the court to intervene to preserve the status quo until the merits are determined." Dataphase, 640 F.2d at 113. The burden of proof is on the party seeking injunctive relief. United States v. Dorgan, 522 F.2d 969, 973 (8th Cir. 1975).

Additionally, "a party moving for a preliminary injunction must necessarily establish a relationship between the injury claimed in the party's motion and the conduct asserted in the complaint." Devose v. Herrington, 42 F.3d 470 (8th Cir. 1994).

Despite plaintiff's request for free materials, there is no indication at this time that plaintiff is being denied legal supplies. Plaintiff has made multiple filings in this case, and defendants have yet to even be served with process.

Plaintiff's claims in his complaint that he was wrongfully found guilty of a conduct violation are, in essence, due process claims. To establish a due process violation, plaintiff must

show a deprivation of a liberty or property interest protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. Paul v. Davis, 424 U.S. 693, 710-12 (1976). The Due Process Clause does not protect prisoners from every adverse change in their confinement. Sandin v. Connor, 515 U.S. 472, 478 (1995). If the conditions and degree of confinement are within the sentence imposed and do not otherwise violate the Constitution, prisoners have no claim under the Due Process Clause. Montanye v. Haymes, 427 U.S. 236, 242 (1976). See also Hewitt v. Helms, 459 U.S. 460, 468 (1983) (prisoners have no inherent right to remain in general population). Disciplinary action taken in response to a prisoner's misconduct "falls within the expected parameters of the sentence." Sandin, 515 U.S. at 485.

To determine whether prisoners have a liberty interest under state law, the court looks at the nature of the deprivation. Id. at 481-83. There is no liberty interest in the use of certain procedures by the state. Phillips v. Norris, 320 F.3d 844, 847 (8th Cir. 2003) (citing Kennedy v. Blankenship, 100 F.3d 640, 643 (8th Cir. 1996) ("Due Process Clause does not federalize state law procedural requirements")). Generally, state-created liberty interests are "limited to freedom from restraint which . . . imposes atypical and significant hardship on the inmate in relation to the ordinary incidents of prison life." Sandin, 515 U.S. at 484; Portley-El v. Brill, 288 F.3d 1063, 1065 (8th Cir. 2001) (inmate who makes a due process challenge to his confinement "must make a threshold showing that the deprivation of which he complains imposed an 'atypical and significant hardship.'") Segregated confinement does not normally "present a dramatic departure from the basic conditions" of prison life. Sandin, 515 U.S. at 485-86. It has been consistently held that assignment to segregation, even without cause, is not itself an atypical significant hardship. Phillips v. Norris, 320 F.3d at 847. Plaintiff's claims regarding his conduct violation should be dismissed.

Although plaintiff's remaining allegations may not be sufficient to withstand a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment, they are sufficient, when liberally construed, to allow plaintiff to proceed at this stage.

The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 requires inmates to pay the filing fee when bringing a civil case or filing an appeal in forma pauperis. 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The records

available to the court indicate plaintiff is capable of making an initial payment of \$2.00¹ toward the filing fee. Plaintiff should contact prison officials to have the initial payment processed. In the future, prison officials will withdraw funds from plaintiff's account and forward them to the court, until the filing fee is paid in full. If plaintiff fails to make the initial payment, his claims may be dismissed for failure to comply with court orders. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Pursuant to L.R. 7.1, suggestions in opposition to pending motions should be filed within twelve days after the motion is filed. Reply suggestions should be filed within twelve days after the suggestions in opposition are filed. In some circumstances, the court will give the parties additional time to file suggestions or reply suggestions. Unless an order is issued extending the time, responses and suggestions must be filed within the twelve days allotted by the Rule. Requests for an extension of time should be filed prior to the expiration of the twelve days allowed for a response. Responses and suggestions filed out-of-time, without prior leave of court, may not be considered when the court issues its ruling on the pending matter.

Plaintiff's motion for a pretrial conference is premature and is denied. Plaintiff's discovery requests, docketed as Certificates of Service, are also premature and are improperly filed with this court. Discovery is properly conducted after an answer has been filed and initial disclosures have been made by the parties. Additionally, as provided in Local Rule 26.4, discovery requests are to be served upon opposing parties or counsel, but shall not be filed with the court except upon order of the court. Plaintiff is directed to comply with Rules 26 and 26.4 in his future filings regarding discovery.

Plaintiff's motion for copies of his filings is granted, in part, and denied, in part. Plaintiff will not be required to forward to defendants paper copies of filings made with this court because defendants will receive these filings via the court's electronic case filing system. Documents

¹The initial payment is assessed at "20 percent of the greater of (A) the average monthly deposits to the prisoner's account; or (B) the average monthly balance in the prisoner's account for the 6-month period immediately preceding the filing of the complaint or notice of appeal." The installment payments will be assessed at "20 percent of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's account. The agency having custody of the prisoner shall forward payments from the prisoner's account to the clerk of the court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 until the filing fees are paid." 28 U.S.C. § 1915. If plaintiff has not signed an authorization for release of inmate account funds, he will need to do so promptly.

that are not be filed with the court, however, such as discovery requests made to defendants, must be submitted by plaintiff directly to defendants in paper form.

Plaintiff's request that this court forward to him copies of all documents he files in this case is denied. Although plaintiff has been granted in forma pauperis status and allowed to proceed without paying the filing fee in advance, he remains responsible for his own costs of litigation.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for copies of filings is granted, in part, and denied, in part, as set forth above. [7] It is further

ORDERED that plaintiff's request for copies of his filing is denied. It is further

ORDERED that the court waives plaintiff's requirement to serve defendants with copies of all pleadings filed with the court, with the exception of discovery requests, which must be submitted directly to defendants in paper form. It is further

ORDERED that plaintiff's motions for discovery and a pretrial conference are denied as premature. [6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14] It is further

ORDERED that plaintiff is granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. It is further

ORDERED that within thirty days, plaintiff make an initial payment of \$2.00 toward the \$350.00 filing fee. It is further

ORDERED that within thirty days, the Attorney General of Missouri notify the court, in writing, for which defendants he will and will not waive service of process. It is further

ORDERED that defendants answer or otherwise respond, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 and 12, within sixty days, if service of process is waived, or within twenty days after service of process, if service of process is not waived. It is further

ORDERED that defendants are granted leave to depose plaintiff at his place of incarceration. It is further

RECOMMENDED that plaintiff's claims regarding a conduct violation be dismissed, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, for failure to state a claim for which relief can be granted.

RECOMMENDED that plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief seeking free legal supplies be denied. [10]

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties may make specific written exceptions to this recommendation within twenty days. The District Judge will consider only exceptions to the specific proposed findings and recommendations of this report. Exceptions should not include matters outside of the report and recommendation. Other matters should be addressed in a separate pleading for consideration by the Magistrate Judge.

The statute provides for exceptions to be filed within ten days of the service of the report and recommendation. The court has extended that time to twenty days, and thus, additional time to file exceptions will not be granted unless there are exceptional circumstances. Failure to make specific written exceptions to this report and recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to appeal. See L.R. 74.1(a)(2).

Dated this 17th day of October, 2007, at Jefferson City, Missouri.

/s/ William A. Knox

WILLIAM A. KNOX
United States Magistrate Judge